REMARKS

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner points out that Applicants' arguments presented in their last response were flawed because the parallel imaging feature of the invention was not defined in the claims. Applicants have amended claims 1, 20, 21 and 22 to include the parallel image limitation. Accordingly, for reasons asserted in the previous response, the claims are novel and non-obviousness over the cited reference.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Allan M. Wheatcraft, 36,307
W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc.
551 Paper Mill Road
P.O. Box 9206
Newark, DE 19714-9206
(302) 738-4880

Date: November 22, 2005

PAGE 7/9 * RCVD AT 11/22/2005 10:53:44 AM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/30 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:302 292 4153 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-54